



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/594,502 06/16/00 HASHII

T 47408-20007.

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
2000 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N.W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20006-1888

QM12/1107

EXAMINER

ROSE, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3723

DATE MAILED:

11/07/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/594,502

Applicant(s)

Hashii

Examiner

Robert Rose

Group Art Unit

3723



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 16, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3723

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on June 17, 1999. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Japanese application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).
2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.
3. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
4. Claims 1-3 are presented for examination.
5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1 it is not clear whether the continuous grinding of the second step is done in the presence of the fixed abrasive grains from the first step. Further, it is not clear from the claim whether the grinding takes place continuously from the first step to the second step, or whether the continuous grinding takes place only within each step. Clarification in the claim is needed. In claim 3, is the term "both" intended to refer to "both sides" or to "side grinding...and chamfer grinding"?
6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 3723

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hasegawa et al(EP 0745456). Hasegawa et al disclose a method of specular polishing of a wafer edge comprising polishing in a first step with fixed abrasive grains adhered to a tape, followed by polishing with a rotary buff in the presence of free abrasive grains.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Masumura et al is cited of interest to show two-step mirror polishing of a wafer in the presence of a slurry, with coarse and fine polishing steps performed on the front and back surfaces of the wafer. Kato et al is cited to show both sides grinding of a wafer, followed by polishing of both sides in the presence of a slurry. Hasegawa et al('539) is cited to show honing of a chamfered portion of a wafer followed by polishing.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert Rose at telephone number (703) 308-1360.

Rr

October 31, 2000.

ROBERT A. ROSE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

ART UNIT 323

